UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,086	04/15/2004	Shin Matsuda	81716.0123	7174
26021 7590 02/11/2008 HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P. 1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS			EXAMINER	
			MENON, KRISHNAN S	
SUITE 1400 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Occurrence	10/825,086	MATSUDA ET AL.	MATSUDA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Krishnan S. Menon	1797				
The MAILING DATE of this commun Period for Reply	ication appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence addres	ss			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comr - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum st - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a nunication. atutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC will, by statute, cause the application to become a	ICATION. A reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this commuNABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 15 April 2004					
· <u> </u>	2b) This action is non-final.					
'	-					
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims		,				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are pending in the a	application					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	TO WILLIAM HOLL COLORGIA (IOI).					
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) 1-39 are subject to restricti	on and/or election requirement					
o) Claim(s) 1-39 are subject to restrict	on and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by th	e Examiner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any obje	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	the correction is required if the drawin	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	l.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-1	152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
2. Certified copies of the priority3. Copies of the certified copies	documents have been received. documents have been received in of the priority documents have bee anal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Sta	ige			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	PTO-948) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 				

Application/Control Number: 10/825,086 Page 2

Art Unit: 1797

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

 Claims 1-29, drawn to micromechanical chip, classified in class 422, subclass 100.

 Claims 30-39, drawn to method of making a micromechanical chip, classified in class 264, subclass 667.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another materially different process such as machining or etching.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

Application/Control Number: 10/825,086 Page 3

Art Unit: 1797

(c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Species Election:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Species represented by the figures 1A, 2A, 5A, 9A, 13A, 18 A.

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, *** generic.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would

Art Unit: 1797

not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

A telephone call was made to Lawrence McClure on 1/30/08 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krishnan S. Menon whose telephone number is 571-272-1143. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R. Sample can be reached on 571-272-1376. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/825,086 Page 7

Art Unit: 1797

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Krishnan S Menon/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797